available for combination but did not include steps of testing for pre or post electing accuracy as noted by the Examiner. Wise at least had ordinary skill in the art at the time.

Katayama is the year 2000 and not in the same art classes as the other referenced and must have ability to process a plethora of information, collect a plurality of processing results and on that basis, set a new goal for each system considering the goal of the entire system.

There is no reason for a master-slave system in applicant's invention as all units are identical and equal.

The Examiner cites 1988 and 1992 federal circuit cases for authority as to the motivation to combine references. Applicant submits that the cases cited and discussed in the amendment dated February 5, 2001 clearly requires the Examiner to show particular findings. The court notes in Werner Kotzab "particular findings must be made as to the reason the skilled artisan, with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would have selected these components for combination in the manner claimed." The court also says in Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Philip Morris Inc., that "whether the prior art would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art that this process should be carried out and would have a reasonable likeihood of success, viewed in the light of the prior art." In order to satisfy this criterion, the party alleging obviousness must show a suggestion, motivation, or teaching to combine the prior references as well as a reasonable expectation of success.

Applicant submits that the application as now presented is believed in condition for allowance and action to that request is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FIDLAR AND CHAMBERS,

Date: 9-26-01

By _____
H. Vincent Harsha
Reg. No. 18,045

ROCKEY, MILNAMOW & KATZ, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza
180 North Stetson Avenue - Suite 4700
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Phone: (312) 616-5400
(309) 797-0864
Fax: (312) 616-5460
(309) 764-1485